arXiv:1611.03105v2 [cs.SY] 12 Nov 2016

Formation Control for Multi-Agent Systems with Connectivity Preservation and Event-Triggered Controllers ⋆

Xinlei Yi, Jieqiang Wei, Dimos V. Dimarogonas, Karl H. Johansson

The ACCESS Linnaeus Centre and Electrical Engineering, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 100 44, Stockholm, Sweden (e-mail: xinleiy, jieqiang, dimos, kallej@kth.se).

Abstract: In this paper, event-triggered controllers and corresponding algorithms are proposed to establish formation with connectivity preservation for multi-agent systems. Each agent only needs to update its control input and broadcast this control input together with its state information to its neighbors at its own triggering times. Two types of system dynamics, single integrators and double integrators, are considered. As a result, all agents converge to a formation exponentially with connectivity preservation, and Zeno behavior can be excluded. Numerical simulations are provided to show the effectiveness of the theoretical results.

Keywords: Multi-agent systems, formation control, connectivity, event-triggered control.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last two decades, numerous contributions have been given in the study of distributed cooperative control, including consensus control and formation control, etc, for multi-agent systems, see e.g., Jadbabaie et al. (2003), Olfati-Saber and Murray (2004), Moreau (2004), Ren and Beard (2005), Liu et al. (2011). In these contributions, there are two common assumptions that are assumed expressly or implicitly. One is that all agents must maintain a (strongly or weakly) connected communication graph either for all time or in an average sense. Another one is that the information can be continuously transmitted between agents. However, it is not straightforward to verify the connectivity since the states of agents change during the evolution of the system and thus the connection between two agents also changes. Moreover, it may be also unpractical to require continuous communication for real applications.

Connectivity preservation is a fundamental problem in the study of many areas, such as mobile robots. Normally, mobile robots have limited communication, including sensing and broadcasting, capabilities and one robot can only communicate with other robots that are within close enough distance. It is natural to model the interaction between a group of mobile robots with limited communication radii as a multi-agent system and the corresponding communication graph is determined by their relative distances. Specifically, if we assume that, for simplicity, all agents have the same communication radius then there are no edges between any agents such that their distance is larger than this radius. In other words, edges may only exist between agents that their distance is less than the radius. Motivated by this, many researchers studied distributed cooperative control for multi-agent systems with connectivity preservation, see e.g., Spanos and Murray (2004), Dimarogonas and Kyriakopoulos (2007), Ji and Egerstedt (2007), Zavlanos and Pappas (2007), Ajorlou et al. (2010), Kan et al. (2012), Boskos and Dimarogonas (2015).

One the other hand, one common method to avoid continuous communication is using periodical sampling. However the drawbacks of this method are that it normally requires a large amount of agents take action in a synchronous manner and it is not efficient. Motivated by the future trend that agents can be equipped with embedded microprocessors with limited resources to transmit and collect information, event-triggered control was introduced by Bernhardsson and Åström (1999), Tabuada (2007). Instead of using the continuous state to realize desired convergence properties, the control in the event-triggered control strategy is piecewise constant between the triggering times which need to be determined. The key points in event-triggered control are how to design the event-triggered controller to determine the corresponding triggering times and how to exclude the Zeno behavior. For continuous-time multi-agent systems, the Zeno behavior is the behavior that there are infinite number of triggers in a finite time interval, see Johansson et al. (1999). To name a few existing works on multi-agent systems with event-triggered controllers, see e.g., Dimarogonas et al. (2012), Garcia et al. (2013), Seyboth et al. (2013), Meng and Chen (2013), Fan et al. (2013), Nowzari and Cortés (2016).

In this paper, we study formation control for multi-agent systems with connectivity preservation and event-triggered communication. We propose distributed conditions for agents to determine their triggering times and a corresponding algorithm for each agent to avoid continuous checking of its own triggering condition. Moreover, it is only at its triggering times that each agent needs to update its control input by sensing the relative po-

⋆ This work was supported by the Knut and Alice Wallenberg Foundation, the Swedish Foundation for Strategic Research, and the Swedish Research Council.

sitions between itself and its neighbors, to broadcast its triggering information, including current triggering time, its state and control input at this time, to its neighbors. In other words, all agents only need to do communication at their triggering times and this occurs in asynchronous manner. As a result, all agents converge to a formation exponentially with connectivity preservation. In addition, Zeno behavior can be excluded by proving that the inter-event times are lower bounded by a positive constant. Two related existing papers are Yu and Antsaklis (2012), Fan and Hu (2015). However, Yu and Antsaklis (2012) didn't explicitly exclude the Zeno behavior, but it is well known that such behavior can cause problem, see Johansson et al. (1999). And it was under the assumption that no agent exhibits Zeno behavior, Fan and Hu (2015) proved asymptotic rendezvous can be achieved.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the preliminaries. The main results are stated in Section 3 and Section 4. Simulations are given in Section 5. Finally, the paper is concluded in Section 6.

Notions: $\|\cdot\|$ represents the Euclidean norm for vectors or the induced 2-norm for matrices. $|S|$ is the cardinality of set S. $\mathbf{1}_n$ denotes the column vector with each component 1 and dimension n. I_n is the n dimension identity matrix. $\rho(\cdot)$ stands for the spectral radius for matrices and $\rho_2(\cdot)$ indicates the minimum positive eigenvalue for matrices having positive eigenvalues. Given two symmetric matrices M, N, $M \geqslant N$ means $M - N$ is a positive semi-definite matrix. The notation $A \otimes B$ means the Kronecker product of matrices A and B.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we review some definitions and results on algebraic graph theory and formation control, for more details see Mesbahi and Egerstedt (2010).

2.1 Algebraic Graph Theory

For a *undirected graph* $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, A)$ with n nodes (vertices), the set of nodes $\mathcal{V} = \{1, \ldots, n\}$, set of edges $\mathcal{E} \subseteq \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$, and the *adjacency matrix* $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ given by $a_{ij} = 1$ if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$, and $a_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Let $N_i = \{j \in \mathcal{V} | (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}\}$ and $deg(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_{ij}$ denotes the *neighbors* and *degree* of agent i, respectively. The *degree matrix* of graph $\mathcal{G}$ is defined as $Deg = diag([deg(1), \cdots, deg(n)])$. The *Laplacian matrix* is defined as $L = Deg - A$.

Similarly, we can define the *weighted graph* $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \Omega)$ with $\Omega = (\omega_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is a nonnegative symmetric matrix and $\omega_{ij} > 0$ if $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$. And we denote the corresponding *Laplacian matrix* as L_ω.

A *path* of length k between agent i and agent j is a subgraph with distinct agents $i_0 = i, \ldots, i_k = j \in \mathcal{V}$ and edges (i_j, i_{j+1}), $j = 0, \ldots, k-1$. A graph is *connected* if there is a path between any two agents.

Let m denotes the number of edges in $\mathcal{G}$, i.e., $m = |\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})|$ and label the edges in $\mathcal{G}$ as $e_1, \cdots, e_m$. And denote $W = diag\{\omega(e_1), \cdots, \omega(e_m)\}$, where $\omega(e_k) = \omega_{ij}$ with e_k being the label of edge (i, j). After assigning a direction to each edge, the $n \times m$ *incidence matrix* $D = (d_{ij})$ is defined as

$$d_{ij} = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if agent } i \text{ is the tail of edge } e_j, \\ 1 & \text{if agent } i \text{ is the head of edge } e_j, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

Lemma 2.1. $DD^\top$ is independent of the labels and orientations given to $\mathcal{G}$, and $DD^\top = L, DWD^\top = L_\omega$.

Lemma 2.2. Let $K_n = I_n - \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{1_n}\mathbf{1_n}^\top$ and assume $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, then $\rho_2(DD^\top) > 0$, $\rho(K_n) = 1$ and

$$0 \leqslant \rho_2(DD^\top)K_n \leqslant DD^\top. \quad (2)$$

Proof. $\rho_2(DD^\top) > 0$ is straightforward since $\mathcal{G}$ is connected.

From Geršgorin disc theorem, we know that $\rho(K_n) \leqslant 1$. From $det(K_n - I_n) = 0$, we know that 1 is an eigenvalue of K_n. Thus $\rho(K_n) = 1$.

$K_n \geqslant 0$ is also straightforward since we can regard K_n as the Laplacian matrix of a complete graph.

For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, there exist $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $y = y_0 + \zeta \mathbf{1}_n$ and $y_0 \perp \mathbf{1}_n$. From

$$\rho_2(DD^\top) = \min_{x \perp \mathbf{1}_n, x \neq 0} \frac{x^\top DD^\top x}{\|x\|^2}, \ \rho(K_n) = \max_{x \neq 0} \frac{x^\top K_n x}{\|x\|^2},$$

we get

$$y^\top DD^\top y = y_0^\top DD^\top y_0 \geqslant \rho_2(DD^\top)\|y_0\|^2,$$

and

$$y^\top K_n y = y_0^\top K_n y_0 \leqslant \rho(K_n)\|y_0\|^2 = \|y_0\|^2.$$

Thus

$$y^\top DD^\top y \geqslant \rho_2(DD^\top)\|y_0\|^2 \geqslant \rho_2(DD^\top) y^\top K_n y.$$

In conclusion, (2) holds.

2.2 Formation Control Problem

Given a connected graph $\mathcal{G}$, let $d_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denotes the *desired internode displacement* of edge $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$. Denote $\Phi = \{(\tau_1^\top, \ldots, \tau_n^\top)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{np} | \tau_i - \tau_j = d_{ij}, \text{ for } (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})\}$. We say that the set of desired internode displacements $\{d_{ij}, (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})\}$ is *feasible* if $\Phi \neq \varnothing$.

Consider a multi-agent system with n agents corresponding to the n nodes in this graph. Let $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denotes the position of agent i at time $t \geqslant 0$. A group of agents are said to converge to a *formation* if

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} x_i(t) - x_j(t) = d_{ij}$$

for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$.

In practice, agents normally have limited communication capabilities. For simplicity we assume all agents have the same communication radius $\Delta > 0$. We say the graph $\mathcal{G}$ and the multi-agent system are *consistent* if $\|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\| \leqslant \Delta$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$ and all time $t \geqslant 0$. Namely, the communication channels are kept for all time. Notice here we assume the following.

Assumption 2.3. The set of desired internode displacements $\{d_{ij}, (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})\}$, is feasible and $\|d_{ij}\| < \Delta$.

Definition 2.4. A group of agents are said to converge to a formation with connectivity preservation if they converge

to a formation while the graph $\mathcal{G}$ remains consistent with their dynamics.

3. FORMATION CONTROL WITH CONNECTIVITY PRESERVATION: SINGLE INTEGRATORS

In this section, we consider the case when the dynamics of agents can be modeled as single integrators given by

$$\dot{x}_i(t) = u_i(t),\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \tag{3}$$

From Assumption 2.3, we know $\Phi \neq \varnothing$. Choose $(\tau_1^\top, \ldots, \tau_n^\top)^\top \in \Phi$ and let $y_i(t) = x_i(t) - \tau_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Then, we can rewrite the above multi-agent system as

$$\dot{y}_i(t) = u_i(t),\ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \tag{4}$$

For $\|y_i - y_j\| < \Delta - \|d_{ij}\|$, the edge-tension function ν_{ij} (introduced first in Ji and Egerstedt (2007)) is defined as

$$\nu_{ij}(\Delta, y) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{\|y_i - y_j\|^2}{\Delta - \|d_{ij}\| - \|y_i - y_j\|}, & \text{if } (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

with

$$\frac{\partial \nu_{ij}(\Delta, y)}{\partial y_i} = \frac{2\Delta - 2\|d_{ij}\| - \|y_i - y_j\|}{(\Delta - \|d_{ij}\| - \|y_i - y_j\|)^2}(y_i - y_j),$$

if $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$, and $\frac{\partial \nu_{ij}(\Delta, y)}{\partial y_i} = 0$ otherwise.

We denote as $\omega_{ij}(t)$ the weight coefficient of the partial derivative of ν_{ij} with respect to y_i as above, i.e.,

$$\omega_{ij}(t) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{2\Delta - 2\|d_{ij}\| - \|y_i(t) - y_j(t)\|}{(\Delta - \|d_{ij}\| - \|y_i(t) - y_j(t)\|)^2}, & \text{if } (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G}), \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

Note that $\omega_{ij}(t)$ can also be written as a function of $x_i(t)$ and $x_j(t)$ since $y_i(t) - y_j(t) = x_i(t) - x_j(t) - d_{ij}$.

In order to reduce the overall need of communication and system updates, we use the following event-triggered controller

$$u_i(t) = \sum_{j \in N_i} -\omega_{ij}(t^i_{k_i(t)})(y_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - y_j(t^i_{k_i(t)})) \tag{7}$$

$$= \sum_{j \in N_i} -\omega_{ij}(t^i_{k_i(t)})(x_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - x_j(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - d_{ij}), \tag{8}$$

where $k_i(t) = arg\max_k\{t^i_k \leqslant t\}$, and the increasing time sequence $\{t^i_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$, which is named as *triggering times*, is agent-wise and normally assuming $t^i_1 = 0$, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$.

Remark 3.1. We can see that the control input (8) only updates at the triggering times.

In the following theorem, we will give triggering conditions to determine the triggering times such that the formation with connectivity preservation can be established and the Zeno behavior can be excluded.

Theorem 3.2. Assume the Assumption 2.3 holds and the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected. Assume that at the initial time $t = 0$,

$$\|x_i(0) - x_j(0) - d_{ij}\| = \|y_i(0) - y_j(0)\| < \Delta - \|d_{ij}\|, \tag{9}$$

for all $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$. Given the first triggering time $t^i_1 = 0$, agent i determines the triggering times $\{t^i_k\}_{k=2}^\infty$ by

$$t^i_{k+1} = \max_{r \geqslant t^i_k}\{r : \|e_i(t)\| \leqslant \alpha e^{-\beta t}, \forall t \in [t^i_k, r]\} \tag{10}$$

where

$$e_i(t) = \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t)(x_i(t) - x_j(t) - d_{ij}) - \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t^i_{k_i(t)})(x_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - x_j(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - d_{ij}),$$

$\alpha > 0$, and $0 < \beta < \beta_0$ with $\beta_0 = \frac{\rho_2(DD^\top)}{\Delta_0}$ and $\Delta_0 = \max_{(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})} \Delta - \|d_{ij}\|$. Then the multi-agent system (3) with event-triggered controller (8) will converge to a formation exponentially with connectivity preservation, and Zeno behavior will be excluded.

Proof. This theorem holds if we can prove that

- $\|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\| \leqslant \Delta, \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G}), \forall t \geqslant 0$;
- $\lim_{t\to\infty} x_i(t) - x_j(t) = d_{ij}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$, exponentially;
- there exists $\xi_i > 0$, such that $t^i_{k+1} - t^i_k \geqslant \xi_i$, $\forall i = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\forall k = 1, 2, \ldots$.

(i) We define the total tension energy of $\mathcal{G}$ as

$$\nu(\Delta, y) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in N_i} \nu_{ij}(\Delta, y), \tag{11}$$

where $y(t) = (y_1^\top(t), \ldots, y_n^\top(t))^\top$. The time derivative of $\nu(\Delta, y(t))$ along the multi-agent system (4) with event-triggered controller (7) is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\nu}(\Delta, y(t)) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in N_i} \Big[\frac{\partial \nu_{ij}(\Delta, y)}{\partial y_i}\Big]^\top\Big|_{y=y(t)} \dot{y}_i(t) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in N_i} [\omega_{ij}(t)(y_i(t) - y_j(t))]^\top \\ &\quad \times \sum_{j \in N_i} -\omega_{ij}(t^i_{k_i(t)})(y_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - y_j(t^i_{k_i(t)})) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in N_i} [\omega_{ij}(t)(y_i(t) - y_j(t))]^\top \\ &\quad \times [e_i(t) - \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t)(y_i(t) - y_j(t))] \\ &\leqslant - \|L_\omega y(t)\|^2 + a\|L_\omega y(t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{4a}\sum_{i=1}^n \|e_i(t)\|^2, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

for all $0 < a < 1$. From (10), we know that

$$\|e_i(t)\| \leqslant \alpha e^{-\beta t}, \forall t \geqslant 0. \tag{13}$$

Hence

$$\dot{\nu}(\Delta, y(t)) \leqslant \frac{n\alpha^2}{4a} e^{-2\beta t}, \forall t \geqslant 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\Delta, y(t)) &\leqslant \nu(\Delta, y(0)) + \frac{n\alpha^2}{8a\beta}[1 - e^{-2\beta t}] \\ &\leqslant k_\nu, \forall t \geqslant 0, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_\nu &= \nu(\Delta, y(0)) + \frac{n\alpha^2}{8a\beta} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j\in N_i}\frac{\|x_i(0)-x_j(0)-d_{ij}\|^2}{\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-\|x_i(0)-x_j(0)-d_{ij}\|} + \frac{n\alpha^2}{8a\beta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{15}
$$

Then, for any $(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$ and $t\geqslant 0$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu_{ij}(\Delta, y(t)) &= \frac{\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|^2}{\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|} \\
&\leqslant 2\nu(\Delta, y(t)) \leqslant 2k_\nu.
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence

$$
\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\| \leqslant k_{ij}, \tag{16}
$$

where

$$
k_{ij} = -k_\nu + \sqrt{k_\nu^2 + 2k_\nu(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|)}. \tag{17}
$$

Noting $k_{ij}<\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|x_i(t)-x_j(t)\| = \|x_i(t)-\tau_i-(x_j(t)-\tau_j)+d_{ij}\| \\
=&\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)+d_{ij}\| \leqslant \|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\| + \|d_{ij}\| \\
\leqslant& k_{ij}+\|d_{ij}\| < \Delta,
\end{aligned} \tag{18}
$$

and thus connectivity maintenance is established.

(ii) Let $e(t)=(e_1^\top(t),\dots,e_n^\top(t))^\top$, $\bar{y}(t)=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n y_i(t)$ and $\delta(t)=y(t)-\mathbf{1}_n\otimes\bar{y}(t)=(K_n\otimes I_p)y(t)$. We consider the following candidate Lyapunov function

$$
V(t) = \frac{1}{2}\delta^\top(t)\delta(t) = \frac{1}{2}y^\top(t)(K_n\otimes I_p)y(t). \tag{19}
$$

Then its derivative is

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\dot{V}(t) = y^\top(t)(K_n\otimes I_p)\dot{y}(t) \\
=&y^\top(t)(K_n\otimes I_p)[-(DWD^\top\otimes I_p)y(t)+e(t)] \\
=&-y^\top(t)(DWD^\top\otimes I_p)y(t)+\delta^\top(t)e(t) \\
\leqslant&-\frac{2}{\Delta_0}y^\top(t)(DD^\top\otimes I_p)y(t)+\beta_0\delta^\top(t)\delta(t)+\frac{1}{4\beta_0}\|e(t)\|^2 \\
\leqslant&-2\beta_0 y^\top(t)(K_n\otimes I_p)y(t)+\beta_0\delta^\top(t)\delta(t)+\frac{1}{4\beta_0}\|e(t)\|^2 \\
=&-2\beta_0 V(t)+\frac{1}{4\beta_0}\|e(t)\|^2 \\
\leqslant&-2\beta_0 V(t)+\frac{n\alpha^2}{4\beta_0}e^{-2\beta t},
\end{aligned} \tag{20}
$$

where the first inequality holds since W is diagonal and its diagonal elements are all not smaller than $\frac{2}{\delta_0}$ and the second inequality holds from Lemma 2.2. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
V(t) \leqslant& V(0)e^{-2\beta_0 t}+\frac{n\alpha^2}{8\beta_0(\beta_0-\beta)}[e^{-2\beta t}-1] \\
<& k_V e^{-2\beta t},
\end{aligned} \tag{21}
$$

where

$$
k_V = V(0)+\frac{n\alpha^2}{8\beta_0(\beta_0-\beta)}. \tag{22}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|^2 &\leqslant 2\|y_i(t)-\bar{y}(t)\|^2+2\|\bar{y}(t)-y_j(t)\|^2 \\
&\leqslant 4V(t) < 4k_V e^{-2\beta t}.
\end{aligned} \tag{23}
$$

Hence

$$
\lim_{t\to\infty} x_i(t)-x_j(t) = \lim_{t\to\infty} y_i(t)-\tau_i-(y_j(t)-\tau_j) = d_{ij}, \tag{24}
$$

exponentially.

(iii) For $(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$, define

$$
f_{ij}(l) = \frac{2\Delta-2\|d_{ij}\|-l}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-l)^2}, l\in[0,\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|), \tag{25}
$$

$$
g_{ij}(l) = \frac{2(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|)^2}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-l)^2}, l\in[0,\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|). \tag{26}
$$

We can easily check that both $f_{ij}(l)$ and $g_{ij}(l)$ are increasing functions on $[0,\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|)$. Then from (16), we have

$$
0<\omega_{ij}(t)<f_{ij}(k_{ij}), \forall t\geqslant 0. \tag{27}
$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|\dot{y}_i(t)\| =& \|e_i(t)-\sum_{j\in N_i}\omega_{ij}(t)(y_i(t)-y_j(t))\| \\
\leqslant& \|e_i(t)\|+\sum_{j\in N_i}\omega_{ij}(t)\|(y_i(t)-y_j(t))\| \\
<& \alpha e^{-\beta t}+\sum_{j\in N_i}2f_{ij}(k_{ij})\sqrt{k_V}e^{-\beta t}.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}
$$

From

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\dot{e}_i(t) \\
=&\sum_{j\in N_i}[\dot{\omega}_{ij}(t)(y_i(t)-y_j(t))+\omega_{ij}(t)(\dot{y}_i(t)-\dot{y}_j(t))] \\
=&\sum_{j\in N_i}\Bigg\{\frac{3\Delta-3\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|)^3}\frac{(y_i(t)-y_j(t))^\top}{\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|} \\
&\times(\dot{y}_i(t)-\dot{y}_j(t))(y_i(t)-y_j(t))+\omega_{ij}(t)(\dot{y}_i(t)-\dot{y}_j(t))\Bigg\},
\end{aligned} \tag{29}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d\|e_i(t)\|}{dt} \leqslant \|\dot{e}_i(t)\| \\
\leqslant&\sum_{j\in N_i}\frac{2(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|)^2}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|)^3}\|\dot{y}_i(t)-\dot{y}_j(t)\| \\
\leqslant&\sum_{j\in N_i}g_{ij}(k_{ij})[\|\dot{y}_i(t)\|+\|\dot{y}_j(t)\|] \\
<& c_i e^{-\beta t},
\end{aligned} \tag{30}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_i = \sum_{j\in N_i}g_{ij}(k_{ij})\Big[&2\alpha+\sum_{p\in N_i}2f_{ip}(k_{ip})\sqrt{k_V} \\
&+\sum_{p\in N_j}2f_{jp}(k_{jp})\sqrt{k_V}\Big].
\end{aligned} \tag{31}
$$

Thus, a sufficient condition to guarantee

$$
\alpha e^{-\beta t} \geqslant \|e_i(t)\| = \int_{t_k^i}^{t}\frac{d\|e_i(s)\|}{ds}ds, \forall t\in[t_k^i, t_{k+1}^i),
$$

is

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\alpha e^{-\beta t} \geqslant \int_{t_k^i}^{t}c_i e^{-\beta s}ds = \frac{c_i}{\beta}[e^{-\beta t_k^i}-e^{-\beta t}] \\
\Leftrightarrow&(c_i+\alpha\beta)e^{-\beta t} \geqslant c_i e^{-\beta t_k^i} \Leftrightarrow (c_i+\alpha\beta)e^{-\beta(t-t_k^i)} \geqslant c_i \\
\Leftarrow&(c_i+\alpha\beta)[1-\beta(t-t_k^i)] \geqslant c_i \Leftrightarrow t-t_k^i \leqslant \xi_i,
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\xi_i = \frac{\alpha}{c_i+\alpha\beta} > 0. \tag{32}
$$

In other words, for all $t \in [t_k^i, t_k^i + \xi_i]$, $\|e_i(t)\| < \alpha e^{-\beta t}$ holds. Hence $t_{k+1}^i > t_k^i + \xi_i$.

Apparently, in order to check the inequality in the triggering condition (10), continuous sensing of the relative positions between neighbors is needed, which is a drawback. In the following we will give an algorithm to avoid this. In other words, the following algorithm is an implementation of Theorem 3.2 but it only requires agents to do communication, including sensing and broadcasting, at the triggering times. We name this algorithm as *Self-Triggered Communication Algorithm 1.* The idea is illustrated as follows.

For any agent i, at any time $t \geqslant 0$, it already knows its last triggering time $t_{k_i(t)}^i$, its position at the last triggering time $x_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i)$ and its control input $u_i(t) = u_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i)$ is a constant until it determines its next triggering time. We name the triggering times of an agent, and its position and control input at these triggering times as *triggering information* of this agent. Then it can calculate its position

$$x_i(t) = x_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i) + (t - t_{k_i(t)}^i)u_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i). \tag{33}$$

Similarly, if agent i knows its neighboring agent j's triggering information, agent i can also calculate agent j's position by

$$x_j(t) = x_j(t_{k_j(t)}^j) + (t - t_{k_j(t)}^j)u_j(t_{k_j(t)}^j), \tag{34}$$

which means continuous sensing or broadcasting are not needed any more. In conclusion, we propose the following algorithm.

Self-Triggered Communication Algorithm 1:

(1) Initialize $t_1^i = 0$ and $k = 1$.
(2) At time $s = t_k^i$, agent i uses (33) and (34) to calculate its position $x_i(t)$ and its neighboring agents' positions $x_j(t), \forall j \in N_i$, for all $t \geqslant s$. Then agent i substitutes these positions into $e_i(t)$ and finds out τ_{k+1}^i which is the smallest solution of equation $\|e_i(t)\| = \alpha e^{-\beta t}$.
(3) As time goes on
   - if there exists $j \in N_i$ such that agent j broadcasts its triggering information at $t_0 \in (s, \tau_{k+1}^i)$[1], then agent i updates $s = t_0$ and goes back to Step (2).
   - otherwise, agent i determines $t_{k+1}^i = \tau_{k+1}^i$, updates its control input $u_i(t_{k+1}^i)$ by sensing the relative positions between itself and its neighbors, broadcasts its triggering information to its neighbors, resets $k = k + 1$, and goes back to Step (2).

4. FORMATION CONTROL WITH CONNECTIVITY PRESERVATION: DOUBLE INTEGRATORS

In this section, we consider the case when the dynamics of agents can be modeled as double integrators given by

$$\begin{cases} \dot{x}_i(t) = q_i(t), \\ \dot{q}_i(t) = u_i(t), \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n, \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

where $x_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ still denotes the position of agent i at time t, $q_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denotes the speed and $u_i(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the control input. We can also rewrite (35) as

$$\begin{cases} \dot{y}_i(t) = q_i(t), \\ \dot{q}_i(t) = u_i(t), \ i = 1, 2, \ldots, n. \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

Denote

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}, z_i(t) = \begin{bmatrix} y_i(t) \\ q_i(t) \end{bmatrix},$$

then we can rewrite (36) as

$$\dot{z}_i(t) = (C \otimes I_p)z_i(t) + (B \otimes I_p)u_i(t),$$

One can easily check that (C, B) is controllable and (I_2, C) is observable. Hence, from Kucera (1972), we know that there exist positive constants k_0, k_1 and k_2 such that

$$P > 0, \ \frac{1}{2}(PC + C^\top P) - \beta_0 PBB^\top P + 2I_2 \leqslant 0, \tag{37}$$

with $P = \begin{bmatrix} k_0 & k_1 \\ k_1 & k_2 \end{bmatrix}$.

Similar to the event-triggered controller (8), we use the following event-triggered controller

$$\begin{aligned} & u_i(t) \\ =& -k_1 \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t_{k_i(t)}^i)(y_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i) - y_j(t_{k_i(t)}^i)) \\ & - k_2 \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t_{k_i(t)}^i)(q_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i) - q_j(t_{k_i(t)}^i)) - k_3 q_i(t) \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

$$\begin{aligned} =& -k_1 \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t_{k_i(t)}^i)(x_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i) - x_j(t_{k_i(t)}^i) - d_{ij}) \\ & - k_2 \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t_{k_i(t)}^i)(q_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i) - q_j(t_{k_i(t)}^i)) - k_3 q_i(t), \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

where k_3 is a constant. Here we should highlight that this controller needs continuous feedback because of the item $k_3 q_i(t)$.

Similar to Theorem 3.2, we have the following results.

Theorem 4.1. Assume that the Assumption 2.3 holds, the graph $\mathcal{G}$ is connected, and the initial condition is also satisfied (9) for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$. Suppose $0 < k_3 < \frac{4}{k_2 + \sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}}$. Given the first triggering time $t_1^i = 0$, agent i determines the triggering times $\{t_k^i\}_{k=2}^\infty$ by

$$t_{k+1}^i = \max_{r \geqslant t_k^i} \{r : \|E_i(t)\| \leqslant \alpha_d e^{-\beta_d t}, \forall t \in [t_k^i, r]\} \tag{40}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} E_i(t) =& k_1 e_i(t) + k_2 e_{qi}(t), \\ e_{qi}(t) =& \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t)(q_i(t) - q_j(t)) \\ & - \sum_{j \in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t_{k_i(t)}^i)(q_i(t_{k_i(t)}^i) - q_j(t_{k_i(t)}^i)), \end{aligned}$$

$\alpha_d > 0$, and $0 < \beta_d < (2 - k_4)\rho_2(P)$ with $k_4 = k_3 \frac{k_2 + \sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}}{2} < 2$. Then the multi-agent system (35) with event-triggered controller (39) will converge to a formation exponentially with connectivity preservation, and Zeno behavior will be excluded.

Proof. This theorem holds if we can prove that

- $\|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\| \leqslant \Delta, \forall (i, j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G}), \forall t \geqslant 0$;

[1] This kind of situation can only occur at most finite times during (s, τ_{k+1}^i) since $|N_i|$ is finite and inter-event times of each agent are lower bounded by a positive constant.

- $\lim_{t\to\infty} x_i(t) - x_j(t) = d_{ij}, \forall (i,j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$, exponentially;
- there exists $\xi_i^d > 0$, such that $t_{k+1}^i - t_k^i \geqslant \xi_i^d$, $\forall i = 1,\ldots,n$ and $\forall k = 1,2,\ldots$;
- $\lim_{t\to\infty} q_i(t) = 0$, $\forall i = 1,\ldots,n$.

(i) We define the total tension energy of $\mathcal{G}$ as

$$\nu_d(\Delta, y) = k_1 \nu(\Delta, y) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \|q_i(t)\|^2. \tag{41}$$

Then time derivative of $\nu_d(\Delta, y(t))$ along the multi-agent system (36) with event-triggered controller (38) is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dot{\nu}_d(\Delta, y(t))\\
=&k_1 \sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j\in N_i} \Big[\frac{\partial \nu_{ij}(\Delta, y)}{\partial y_i}\Big]^\top\Big|_{y=y(t)} \dot{y}_i(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i^\top(t)\dot{q}_i(t)\\
=&\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i^\top(t)\Big\{k_1 \sum_{j\in N_i}[\omega_{ij}(t)(y_i(t) - y_j(t))] + u_i(t)\Big\}\\
=&\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i^\top(t)\Big\{E_i(t) - k_2 \sum_{j\in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t)(q_i(t) - q_j(t)) - k_3 q_i(t)\Big\}\\
\leqslant& -\sum_{i=1}^{n}(k_3 - b) q_i^\top(t) q_i(t) + \frac{1}{4b}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|E_i(t)\|^2\\
&- k_2 q^\top(t) L_\omega q(t),
\end{aligned} \tag{42}$$

for all $0 < b < k_3$. From (40), we know that

$$\|E_i(t)\| \leqslant \alpha_d e^{-\beta_d t}, \forall t \geqslant 0. \tag{43}$$

Hence

$$\dot{\nu}_d(\Delta, y(t)) \leqslant \frac{n\alpha_d^2}{4b} e^{-2\beta_d t}, \forall t \geqslant 0.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_d(\Delta, y(t)) \leqslant& \nu_d(\Delta, y(0)) + \frac{n\alpha_d^2}{8b\beta_d}[1 - e^{-2\beta_d t}]\\
\leqslant& k_\nu^d, \forall t \geqslant 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
k_\nu^d =& \nu_d(\Delta, y(0)) + \frac{n\alpha_d^2}{8b\beta_d}\\
=&\frac{k_1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\sum_{j\in N_i}\frac{\|x_i(0) - x_j(0) - d_{ij}\|^2}{\Delta - \|d_{ij}\| - \|x_i(0) - x_j(0) - d_{ij}\|}\\
&+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\|q_i(0)\|^2 + \frac{n\alpha_d^2}{8b\beta_d}.
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Then, for any $(i,j) \in \mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$ and $t \geqslant 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{ij}(\Delta, y(t)) =& \frac{\|y_i(t) - y_j(t)\|^2}{\Delta - \|d_{ij}\| - \|y_i(t) - y_j(t)\|}\\
\leqslant& 2\nu_d(\Delta, y(t)) \leqslant 2k_\nu^d.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|y_i(t) - y_j(t)\| \leqslant k_{ij}^d, \tag{46}$$

where

$$k_{ij}^d = -k_\nu^d + \sqrt{(k_\nu^d)^2 + 2k_\nu^d(\Delta - \|d_{ij}\|)}. \tag{47}$$

Noting $k_{ij}^d < \Delta - \|d_{ij}\|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|x_i(t) - x_j(t)\| = \|x_i(t) - \tau_i - (x_j(t) - \tau_j) + d_{ij}\|\\
=&\|y_i(t) - y_j(t) + d_{ij}\| \leqslant \|y_i(t) - y_j(t)\| + \|d_{ij}\|\\
\leqslant& k_{ij}^d + \|d_{ij}\| < \Delta,
\end{aligned} \tag{48}$$

and thus connectivity maintenance is guaranteed.

(ii) Noting $B^\top P = [\,k_1\ k_2\,]$, we can rewrite the control input (38) as

$$\begin{aligned}
u_i(t) =& -(B^\top P \otimes I_p)\sum_{j\in N_i}\omega_{ij}(t)(z_i(t) - z_j(t)) + E_i(t)\\
&- k_3(B^\top \otimes I_p) z_i(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $z(t) = (z_1^\top(t), \ldots, z_n^\top(t))^\top$, and $\bar{z}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^n z_i(t)$. We consider the following candidate Lyapunov function

$$\begin{aligned}
V_d(t) =& \frac{1}{2}[z(t) - \mathbf{1}_n \bar{z}(t)]^\top (I_n \otimes P \otimes I_p)[z(t) - \mathbf{1}_n \bar{z}(t)]\\
=& \frac{1}{2} z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes P \otimes I_p) z(t).
\end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Then its derivative is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dot{V}_d(t) = z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes P \otimes I_p)\dot{z}(t)\\
=&z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes P \otimes I_p)\Big\{(I_n \otimes C \otimes I_p) z(t)\\
&+ (I_n \otimes B \otimes I_p) u(t)\Big\}\\
=&z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes P \otimes I_p)\Big\{(I_n \otimes C \otimes I_p) z(t)\\
&+ (I_n \otimes B \otimes I_p)[-(L_\omega \otimes B^\top P \otimes I_p) z(t) + E(t)\\
&- k_3(I_n \otimes B^\top \otimes I_p) z(t)]\Big\}\\
=&z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes \frac{PC + CP^\top}{2} \otimes I_p) z(t)\\
&- z^\top(t)(L_\omega \otimes PBB^\top P \otimes I_p) z(t)\\
&- k_3 z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes PBB^\top \otimes I_p) z(t)\\
&+ z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes PB \otimes I_p) E(T),
\end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

where $E(t) = [E_1^\top(t), \ldots, E_n^\top(t)]$. Noting $PBB^\top P \geqslant 0$ and $L_\omega \geqslant 2\beta_0 K_n$ from Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&- z^\top(t)(L_\omega \otimes PBB^\top P \otimes I_p) z(t)\\
\leqslant& -2\beta_0 z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes PBB^\top P \otimes I_p) z(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Noting

$$\frac{PBB^\top + BB^\top P}{2} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{k_1}{2} \\ \frac{k_1}{2} & k_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

one can easily check that $\rho(\frac{PBB^\top + BB^\top P}{2}) = \frac{k_2 + \sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}}{2}$. Noting $k_4 = k_3 \frac{k_2 + \sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}}{2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&- k_3 z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes PBB^\top \otimes I_p) z(t)\\
\leqslant& k_4 z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes I_2 \otimes I_p) z(t).
\end{aligned}$$

Then from above two inequalities and the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
&z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes PB \otimes I_p) E(T)\\
\leqslant& \beta_0 z^\top(t)(K_n \otimes PBB^\top P \otimes I_p) z(t) + \frac{1}{4\beta_0}\|E(t)\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\dot{V}_d(t)\\
\leqslant& z^\top(t)\Big(K_n\otimes\Big[\frac{PA+AP^\top}{2}-\beta_0 PBB^\top P\Big]\otimes I_p\Big)\\
&+k_4 z^\top(t)(K_n\otimes I_2\otimes I_p)z(t)+\frac{1}{4\beta_0}\|E(t)\|^2\\
\leqslant& -(2-k_4)z^\top(t)(K_n\otimes I_2\otimes I_p)z(t)+\frac{1}{4\beta_0}\|E(t)\|^2\\
\leqslant& -2(2-k_4)\rho_2(P)V_d(t)+\frac{n\alpha_d^2}{4\beta_0}e^{-2\beta_d t},
\end{aligned}\tag{51}
$$

where the second inequality holds from (37). Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
V_d(t)\leqslant& V_d(0)e^{-2(2-k_4)\rho_2(P)t}\\
&+\frac{n\alpha_d^2}{8\beta_0((2-k_4)\rho_2(P)-\beta_d)}[e^{-2\beta_d t}-1]\\
<& k_V^d e^{-2\beta_d t},
\end{aligned}\tag{52}
$$

where

$$
k_V^d=V_d(0)+\frac{n\alpha_d^2}{8\beta_0((2-k_4)\rho_2(P)-\beta_d)}.\tag{53}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|^2+\|q_i(t)-q_j(t)\|^2=\|z_i(t)-z_j(t)\|^2\\
&\leqslant 2\|z_i(t)-\bar{z}(t)\|^2+2\|\bar{z}(t)-z_j(t)\|^2\\
&\leqslant 4V_d(t)<4k_V^d e^{-2\beta_d t}.
\end{aligned}\tag{54}
$$

Hence

$$
\lim_{t\to\infty}x_i(t)-x_j(t)=\lim_{t\to\infty}y_i(t)-\tau_i-(y_j(t)-\tau_j)=d_{ij},\tag{55}
$$

and

$$
\lim_{t\to\infty}q_i(t)-q_j(t)=0,\tag{56}
$$

exponentially.

(iii) For $(i,j)\in\mathcal{E}(\mathcal{G})$, define

$$
h_{ij}(l)=\frac{3\Delta-3\|d_{ij}\|-l}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-l)^3},l\in[0,\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|).\tag{57}
$$

We can easily check that $h_{ij}(l)$ is an increasing function on $[0,\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|)$. Similar to (28), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|\dot{q}_i(t)-\dot{q}_j(t)\|\\
=&\|E_i(t)-E_j(t)-k_1\sum_{p\in N_i}\omega_{ip}(t)(y_i(t)-y_p(t))\\
&-k_2\sum_{p\in N_i}\omega_{ip}(t)(q_i(t)-q_p(t))\\
&+k_1\sum_{p\in N_j}\omega_{jp}(t)(y_j(t)-y_p(t))\|\\
&+k_2\sum_{p\in N_j}\omega_{jp}(t)(q_j(t)-q_p(t))-k_3(q_i(t)-q_j(t))\|\\
<& k_{ij}^q e^{-\beta_d t},
\end{aligned}\tag{58}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
k_{ij}^q=&2\alpha_d+2\Big\{(k_1+k_2)\Big[\sum_{p\in N_i}f_{ip}(k_{ip}^d)+\sum_{p\in N_j}f_{jp}(k_{jp}^d)\Big]\\
&+k_3\Big\}\sqrt{k_V^d}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar to (29), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\dot{e}_i(t)\\
=&\sum_{j\in N_i}[\dot{\omega}_{ij}(t)(y_i(t)-y_j(t))+\omega_{ij}(t)(\dot{y}_i(t)-\dot{y}_j(t))]\\
=&\sum_{j\in N_i}\Big\{\frac{3\Delta-3\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|)^3}\frac{(y_i(t)-y_j(t))^\top}{\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|}\\
&\times(q_i(t)-q_j(t))(y_i(t)-y_j(t))+\omega_{ij}(t)(q_i(t)-q_j(t))\Big\},
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\dot{e}_{qi}(t)\\
=&\sum_{j\in N_i}[\dot{\omega}_{ij}(t)(q_i(t)-q_j(t))+\omega_{ij}(t)(\dot{q}_i(t)-\dot{q}_j(t))]\\
=&\sum_{j\in N_i}\Big\{\frac{3\Delta-3\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|)^3}\frac{(y_i(t)-y_j(t))^\top}{\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|}\\
&\times(q_i(t)-q_j(t))(q_i(t)-q_j(t))+\omega_{ij}(t)(\dot{q}_i(t)-\dot{q}_j(t))\Big\}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Similar to (30), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{d\|k_1e_i(t)+k_2e_{qi}(t)\|}{dt}\leqslant k_1\|\dot{e}_i(t)\|+k_2\|\dot{e}_{qi}(t)\|\\
\leqslant&\sum_{j\in N_i}\Big\{k_1\frac{2(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|)^2}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|)^3}\|q_i(t)-q_j(t)\|\\
&+k_2\frac{3\Delta-3\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|}{(\Delta-\|d_{ij}\|-\|y_i(t)-y_j(t)\|)^3}\|q_i(t)-q_j(t)\|^2\\
&+k_2\omega_{ij}(t)(\|\dot{q}_i(t)-\dot{q}_j(t)\|)\Big\}\\
\leqslant&\sum_{j\in N_i}k_1g_{ij}(k_{ij}^d)\|q_i(t)-q_j(t)\|+k_2h_{ij}(k_{ij}^d)\|q_i(t)-q_j(t)\|^2\\
&+k_2f_{ij}(k_{ij}^d)(\|\dot{q}_i(t)-\dot{q}_j(t)\|)\\
<& c_i^d e^{-\beta_d t},
\end{aligned}\tag{59}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
c_i^d=\sum_{j\in N_i}\Big\{&2k_1g_{ij}(k_{ij}^d)\sqrt{k_V^d}+4k_2h_{ij}(k_{ij}^d)k_V^d\\
&+k_2f_{ij}(k_{ij}^d)k_{ij}^q\Big\}.
\end{aligned}\tag{60}
$$

Similar to the way to find ξ_i, we can find

$$
\xi_i^d=\frac{\alpha}{c_i^d+\alpha\beta}>0,\tag{61}
$$

such that $t_{k+1}^i>t_k^i+\xi_i^d$.

(iv) From the above result we have $\lim_{t\to\infty}t_k^i=\infty$. Then from (55) and (56), we know that $\lim_{t\to\infty}u_i(t)=-k_3\lim_{t\to\infty}q_i(t)$. Thus $\lim_{t\to\infty}q_i(t)=0$.

Similar to the analysis after Theorem 3.2, in order to check the inequality in the triggering condition (40), continuous sensing of the relative positions and speeds between neighbors is needed. In the following we will give an algorithm to avoid this by using the same idea as before.

Denote

$$u_i^d(t) = -k_1 \sum_{j\in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t^i_{k_i(t)})(x_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - x_j(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - d_{ij}) - k_2 \sum_{j\in N_i} \omega_{ij}(t^i_{k_i(t)})(q_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - q_j(t^i_{k_i(t)})),$$

which is piecewise constant.

For any agent i, at any time $t \geqslant 0$, it already knows its last triggering time $t^i_{k_i(t)}$, its position at the last triggering time $x_i(t^i_{k_i(t)})$, its speed at the last triggering time $q_i(t^i_{k_i(t)})$, and $u_i^d(t^i_{k_i(t)})$. We name $\{t^i_{k_i(t)}, x_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}), q_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}), u_i^d(t^i_{k_i(t)})\}$ as the *triggering information* of agent i in the double integrators. Then it can calculate its position and speed as follows

$$x_i(t) = \Big[1 - e^{k_3(t^i_{k_i(t)} - t)}\Big]\Big[\frac{q_i(t^i_{k_i(t)})}{k_3} - \frac{u_i^d(t^i_{k_i(t)})}{k_3^2}\Big] + (t - t^i_{k_i(t)})\frac{u_i^d(t^i_{k_i(t)})}{k_3} + x_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}), \tag{62}$$

$$q_i(t) = e^{k_3(t^i_{k_i(t)} - t)}\Big[q_i(t^i_{k_i(t)}) - \frac{u_i^d(t^i_{k_i(t)})}{k_3}\Big] + \frac{u_i^d(t^i_{k_i(t)})}{k_3}. \tag{63}$$

Similarly, if agent i knows its neighboring agent j's triggering information, agent i can also calculate agent j's position and speed as follows

$$x_j(t) = \Big[1 - e^{k_3(t^j_{k_j(t)} - t)}\Big]\Big[\frac{q_j(t^j_{k_j(t)})}{k_3} - \frac{u_j^d(t^j_{k_j(t)})}{k_3^2}\Big] + (t - t^j_{k_j(t)})\frac{u_j^d(t^j_{k_j(t)})}{k_3} + x_j(t^j_{k_j(t)}), \tag{64}$$

$$q_j(t) = e^{k_3(t^j_{k_j(t)} - t)}\Big[q_j(t^j_{k_j(t)}) - \frac{u_j^d(t^j_{k_j(t)})}{k_3}\Big] + \frac{u_j^d(t^j_{k_j(t)})}{k_3}, \tag{65}$$

which means continuous sensing or broadcasting are not needed any more. In conclusion, we propose the following algorithm .

Self-Triggered Communication Algorithm 2:

(1) Initialize $t_1^i = 0$ and $k = 1$.
(2) At time $s = t_k^i$, agent i uses (62)-(65) to calculate its own and its neighbors' positions and speeds $x_i(t), q_i(t), x_j(t), q_j(t), \forall j \in N_i$, for all $t \geqslant s$. Then agent i substitutes these values into $E_i(t)$ and finds out τ_{k+1}^i which is the smallest solution of equation $\|E_i(t)\| = \alpha_d e^{-\beta_d t}$.
(3) As time goes on
- if there exists $j \in N_i$ such that agent j broadcasts its triggering information at $t_0 \in (s, \tau_{k+1}^i)$, then agent i updates $s = t_0$ and goes back to Step (2).
- otherwise, agent i determines $t_{k+1}^i = \tau_{k+1}^i$, updates $u_i^d(t_{k+1}^i)$ by sensing the relative positions between itself and its neighbors, broadcasts its triggering information to its neighbors, resets $k = k + 1$, and goes back to Step (2).

5. SIMULATIONS

In this section, two numerical examples are given to demonstrate the effectiveness of the presented results.

Consider a network of $n = 3$ agents in $\mathbb{R}^2$ whose Laplacian matrix is given by

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The three agents are trying to establish a right triangle formation with

$$d_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, d_{13} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, d_{23} = \begin{pmatrix} -2 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The communication radius is $\Delta = 4$. We have $\beta_0 = 1.5$.

Firstly, we consider the situation that the three agents are modeled as single integrators. The initial positions of agents can be randomly selected as long as the initial condition (9) can be satisfied. Here, the initial position of agents are given by

$$x_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}, x_2(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 3.5 \\ 7 \end{pmatrix}, x_3(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 4.5 \\ 5.5 \end{pmatrix}.$$

One can easily check that both Assumption 2.3 and initial condition (9) hold. Choose $\alpha = 10$ and $\beta = 1$, by applying the Self-Triggered Communication Algorithm 1, we get the evolution of the Lyapunov function $V(t)$ shown in Fig. 1 and the triggering times of each agent shown in Fig. 2, respectively.



Fig. 1. The evolution of $V(t)$.



Fig. 2. The triggering times of each agent.

Secondly, we consider the situation that the three agents are modeled as double integrators. The initial positions of agents are given as before. The initial speeds of agents can be randomly selected and here we choose

$$q_1(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix}, q_2(0) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -2 \end{pmatrix}, q_3(0) = \begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have $P = \begin{bmatrix} 5.0237 & 1.1547 \\ 1.1547 & 1.4502 \end{bmatrix}$, $k_1 = 1.1547$, $k_2 = 1.4502$, and $\rho_2(P) = 1.1096$. Choose $k_3 = \frac{2}{k_2 + \sqrt{k_1^2 + k_2^2}} = 0.6053$, $\alpha_d = 10$, and $\beta_d = 1$, by applying the Self-Triggered Communication Algorithm 2, we get the evolution of the Lyapunov function $V_d(t)$ shown in Fig. 3 and the triggering times of each agent shown in Fig. 4, respectively.



Fig. 3. The evolution of $V_d(t)$.



Fig. 4. The triggering times of each agent.

6. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, formation control for multi-agent systems with limited communication, including sensing and broadcasting, radius is addressed. We first consider the situation that agents are modeled as single integrators. We propose an event-triggered controller and a self-triggered communication algorithm for each agent to avoid continuous communication. Each agent only needs to communicate at its triggering times. As a result a formation can be established exponentially with connectivity preservation and the Zeno behavior can be excluded. Then, these results are extended to double integrators. Future research directions of this work include developing connectivity preservation event-triggered control for agent groups with more general dynamics.

REFERENCES

Ajorlou, A., Momeni, A., and Aghdam, A.G. (2010). A class of bounded distributed control strategies for connectivity preservation in multi-agent systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55(12), 2828–2833.

Bernhardsson, B. and Åström, K.J. (1999). Comparison of periodic and event based sampling for first-order stochastic systems. In *14th IFAC world congress*.

Boskos, D. and Dimarogonas, D.V. (2015). Robust connectivity analysis for multi-agent systems. In *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 6767–6772.

Dimarogonas, D.V., Frazzoli, E., and Johansson, K.H. (2012). Distributed event-triggered control for multi-agent systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(5), 1291–1297.

Dimarogonas, D.V. and Kyriakopoulos, K.J. (2007). Connectivity preserving state agreement for multiple unicycles. In *2007 American Control Conference*, 1179–1184.

Fan, Y., Feng, G., Wang, Y., and Song, C. (2013). Distributed event-triggered control of multi-agent systems with combinational measurements. *Automatica*, 49(2), 671–675.

Fan, Y. and Hu, G. (2015). Connectivity-preserving rendezvous of multi-agent systems with event-triggered controllers. In *2015 54th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 234–239.

Garcia, E., Cao, Y., Yu, H., Antsaklis, P., and Casbeer, D. (2013). Decentralised event-triggered cooperative control with limited communication. *International Journal of Control*, 86(9), 1479–1488.

Jadbabaie, A., Lin, J., and Morse, A.S. (2003). Coordination of groups of mobile autonomous agents using nearest neighbor rules. *IEEE Transactions on automatic control*, 48(6), 988–1001.

Ji, M. and Egerstedt, M.B. (2007). Distributed coordination control of multi-agent systems while preserving connectedness.

Johansson, K.H., Egerstedt, M., Lygeros, J., and Sastry, S. (1999). On the regularization of zeno hybrid automata. *Systems & Control Letters*, 38(3), 141–150.

Kan, Z., Dani, A.P., Shea, J.M., and Dixon, W.E. (2012). Network connectivity preserving formation stabilization and obstacle avoidance via a decentralized controller. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(7), 1827–1832.

Kucera, V. (1972). A contribution to matrix quadratic equations. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 17(3), 344–347.

Liu, B., Lu, W., and Chen, T. (2011). Consensus in networks of multiagents with switching topologies modeled as adapted stochastic processes. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 49(1), 227–253.

Meng, X. and Chen, T. (2013). Event based agreement protocols for multi-agent networks. *Automatica*, 49(7), 2125–2132.

Mesbahi, M. and Egerstedt, M. (2010). *Graph theoretic methods in multiagent networks*. Princeton University Press.

Moreau, L. (2004). Stability of continuous-time distributed consensus algorithms. In *2004 43rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 3998–4003.

Nowzari, C. and Cortés, J. (2016). Distributed event-triggered coordination for average consensus on weight-balanced digraphs. *Automatica*, 68, 237–244.

Olfati-Saber, R. and Murray, R.M. (2004). Consensus problems in networks of agents with switching topology and time-delays. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 49(9), 1520–1533.

Ren, W. and Beard, R.W. (2005). Consensus seeking in multiagent systems under dynamically changing inter-

action topologies. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 50(5), 655–661.

Seyboth, G.S., Dimarogonas, D.V., and Johansson, K.H. (2013). Event-based broadcasting for multi-agent average consensus. *Automatica*, 49(1), 245–252.

Spanos, D.P. and Murray, R.M. (2004). Robust connectivity of networked vehicles. In *2004 43rd IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 2893–2898.

Tabuada, P. (2007). Event-triggered real-time scheduling of stabilizing control tasks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 52(9), 1680–1685.

Yu, H. and Antsaklis, P.J. (2012). Formation control of multi-agent systems with connectivity preservation by using both event-driven and time-driven communication. In *2012 IEEE 51st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 7218–7223.

Zavlanos, M.M. and Pappas, G.J. (2007). Potential fields for maintaining connectivity of mobile networks. *IEEE Transactions on Robotics*, 23(4), 812–816.